



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/719,245

11/21/2003

Robert Mastromatto

23-0454

2202

40158

7590

08/08/2006

WOODS FULLER SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.

ATTN: JEFFREY A. PROEHL

P.O. BOX 5027

SIOUX FALLS, SD 57117

EXAMINER

CHIN, PAUL T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3652

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/719,245

Applicant(s)

MASTROMATTO ET AL.

Examiner

PAUL T. CHIN

Art Unit

3652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on November 21, 2003 was filed and the submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-12 and 18 in the reply filed on March 9, 2006, is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Greenberg (Des. 191,832)**.

Greenberg (Des. 191,832) discloses a sliding device comprising:

a sheet of material; a plurality of sliding members (Figs. 4 and 5) coupled to extend from a face of the sheet of material; the sliding members having the two inner sliders, which can be considered as a first set of sliding members, which are positioned in a central portion of the sheet (see Fig. 4) and the other two outward sliding members, which can be considered as a second set of sliding members, which are positioned in a outer portions of the sheet (Fig. 4).

Art Unit: 3652

Re claims 5-9, Greenberg (Des. 191,832) shows a plurality of straps or handles (see Figs. 1 and 3) which are coupled to the plurality of apertures or cutout portions being positioned proximate to a perimeter edge of the sheet material.

Re claim 10, Greenberg (Des. 191,832) further shows that each sliding member has a substantially convex outer surface (see Figs. 4 and 5).

Re claims 13 and 14, Greenberg (Des. 191,832) shows a generally rectangular main portion (Fig. 3) and an extension portion having a rounded outer edge (Figs. 2,3, and 6).

Re claims 15-17, Greenberg (Des. 191,832) shows at least one handle or a pair of handles (see Figs. 1 and 5) substantially coupled or formed in the extension portion.

5. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Buening et al. (3,666,282)**.

Buening et al. (3,666,282) discloses a sliding device comprising:

a sheet of material (Fig. 1); a plurality of sliding members (Fig. 2) coupled to extend from a face of the sheet of material; the sliding members having the two inner sliders (15,19) (Fig. 2), which can be considered as a first set of sliding members, which are positioned in a central portion of the sheet, and other two outward sliding members (13,17) (Fig. 2), which can be considered as a second set of sliding members, which are positioned in a outer portions of the sheet (Fig. 2).

Re claims 5-9, Buening et al. (3,666,282) shows a plurality of straps or handles (7,7) (see Fig. 1) which are coupled to the plurality of apertures being positioned proximate to a perimeter edge of the sheet material. It is also pointed out that the bosses or the arch sections (37,39,41) having cutout portions, also can be considered as a plurality of handles capable of manipulating the sheet material.

Art Unit: 3652

Re claim 10, Buening et al. (3,666,282) further shows that each sliding member has a substantially convex outer surface (see Figs. 5 and 6).

6. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Dickhaut et al. (Des. 374,846)**.

Dickhaut et al. (Des. 374,846) discloses a sliding device comprising:

a sheet of material (Fig. 6); a plurality of sliding members (Fig. 1) coupled to extend from a face of the sheet of material; the sliding members having a first set of sliding members, which are positioned in a central portion of the sheet (see Fig. 2), and a second set of sliding members, which are positioned in a substantially outer portions of the sheet (Fig. 2).

Re claims 5-9, Dickhaut et al. (Des. 374,846) shows a plurality of straps or handles (see Figs. 1-3) which are coupled to the plurality of apertures or cutout portions (Figs. 4 and 6) being positioned proximate to a perimeter edge of the sheet material.

Re claim 10, Dickhaut et al. (Des. 374,846) further shows that each sliding member has a substantially convex outer surface (see Figs. 4 and 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3652

8. Claims 11, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenberg (Des. 191,832) or Buening et al. (3,666,282) or Dickhaut et al. (Des. 374,846) in view of **Field (3,734,523)**.

Greenberg (Des. 191,832), or Buening et al. (3,666,282), or Dickhaut et al. (Des. 374,846), as presented in sections 10-12 above, does not show a *teflon coating* being applied on the sliding member for reducing friction between the sliding members and the support member.

However, **Field (3,734,523)** shows a *Teflon coating* being applied on the sliding member (44,63) for reducing friction between the sliding members and the support member (Col 4, lines 47-52). Accordingly, It would have been an obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a *Teflon coating* on the sliding members of Greenberg (Des. 191,832) or Buening et al. (3,666,282) or Dickhaut et al. (Des. 374,846) as taught by Field (3,734,523) in order to reduce friction between the contacted surfaces of the sliding members and the support member.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed March 9, 2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The prior art of record still shows the structural limitations as recited in the claims.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAUL T. CHIN whose telephone number is (571) 272-6922. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-THURS (7:30 -6:00 PM).

Art Unit: 3652

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, EILEEN LILLIS can be reached on (571) 272-6928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul T. Chin".

PAUL T. CHIN
Examiner
Art Unit 3652